

REMARKS

Claims 11-34 are pending, with claims 11, 16, 21, 25 and 33 being independent. Claims 11, 16, 21, 25 and 33 have been amended. Reconsideration and allowance of the above-referenced application are respectfully requested.

Claims 11, 12, 15-17, and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Rajwar (Speculative Lock Elision). Claims 11, 15, 16, and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Transactional Memory (Moss). Claims 1, 6, 7, 14 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Moss in view of Lam (Enhancing Software Reliability with Speculative Threads). Claims 21-25, 27 and 31-34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Moss in view of Lam in view of Rajwar. Claims 2-5 and 8-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Moss/Lam in view of Christie (U.S. 6,009,512). Claims 13 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Rajwar in view of "common prior art". Claim 28 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Moss/Lam/Rajwar in view of "common prior art". Claim 26 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Moss/Lam/Rajwar in view of Rajwar.

Claims 29 and 30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Moss/Lam/Rajwar in view of "common prior art". These contentions are respectfully traversed.

Examiner Johnson is thanked for the telephone interview, which was conducted with Mr. Hunter on June 5, 2007. During the interview, the above amendments to the claims and the cited references were discussed. Agreement was reached that the above amendments to the claims serve to clarify the claimed subject matter and would overcome the current rejections. Thus, in view of this clarifying amendment to the claims, withdrawal of the current rejections is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that issue or comment. Because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any


claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

It is respectfully suggested for all of these reasons, that the current rejections are overcome, that none of the cited art teaches or suggests the features which are claimed, and therefore that all of these claims should be in condition for allowance. A formal notice of allowance is thus respectfully requested.

Please apply any necessary charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 5, 2007

for 

Scott C. Harris
Reg. No. 32,030
Attorney for Intel Corporation

Fish & Richardson P.C.
PTO Customer No. 20985
Telephone: (858) 678-5070
Facsimile: (858) 678-5099

WILLIAM E. HUNTER
REG. NO 47,671